

Attorney Docket No. 042846-0312951

Serial No. 09/885,151

Reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1-34, 36-45, and 47-62 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 21, and 29 are amended solely for clarity and to provide proper antecedent basis. The claim amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claims and are not made to overcome the cited references. No claims are cancelled, or added. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all claims pending in this application are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-34, 36-60 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Gilhuly et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,701,378 ("Gilhuly"). Applicants traverse these rejections on the following basis.

Claim 1 includes the features of presenting a plurality of different forms for displaying the transmissible media content and enabling selection, on a wireless client device, of at least one form for displaying transmissible media content, among other things. Independent claims 9, 17, 25, and 53 include similar features, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, multiple types of forms may be used for various applications to display transmissible media content. Different types of forms may include facsimile, memorandum, invitation, and user profile forms (see the specification at page 36, lines 7-9). A plurality of different forms may be associated with the multiple types of forms. The plurality of different forms may include brief forms and full forms, among other forms. For example, full forms may display all the fields of transmissible media content available, while brief forms may display user selected fields (*i.e.*, less than all available fields)(see the specification at page 26, lines 13-15). Forms for each application may include predetermined form fields that are specific to each application (see the specification at page 26, lines 9-10). The forms may be used to display, edit, or create documents that contain transmissible media content on a wireless device (see the specification at page 23, lines 18-20).

Attorney Docket No. 042846-0312951

Serial No. 09/885,151

Reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Gilhuly appears to disclose a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile device upon sensing a triggering event. (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 11-13). A redirector program may be implemented to initiate redirection of user data items upon sensing one or more user selected triggers (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 28-32).

The Examiner alleges that the "data items" of Gilhuly correspond to the claimed "forms" (see numbered paragraph 4, on page 2, of the December 16, 2004 Office Action). This interpretation appears unreasonable and does not find support in Gilhuly. Gilhuly explicitly teaches that data items may include "e-mail messages, calendar events, meeting notifications, address entries, journal entries, personal reminders, etc." (see Gilhuly at col. 2, lines 26-28). While Gilhuly teaches that data items include different types of transmissible media, Gilhuly is silent regarding the user's ability to select fields for displaying the data items. Thus, while Gilhuly discloses that the user may select from among various e-mail messages, calendar events, meeting notifications, address entries, journal entries, personal reminders, Gilhuly does not teach or suggest that the user may select, on the wireless client device, at least one form for displaying the transmissible media content, wherein the forms include user defined fields. Rather, Gilhuly discloses enabling the user to select received e-mail messages, calendar events, meeting notifications, address entries, journal entries, personal reminders and displaying the content in a format defined by the system.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 as allegedly being anticipated by Gilhuly is improper and must be withdrawn at least because Gilhuly fails to disclose presenting a plurality of different forms for displaying transmissible media content and enabling selection, on a wireless client device, of at least one form for displaying transmissible media content.

Similarly, the rejections of independent claims 9, 17, 25, and 53 must also be withdrawn. Further, claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, 26-34, 36-52, 54-60 and 62 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 53, and are allowable by virtue of their dependency as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

Attorney Docket No. 042846-0312951

Serial No. 09/685,151

Reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 61 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gilhuly in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,169,911 to Wagner et al. ("Wagner"). Applicants traverse these rejections on the following basis.

Claim 61 depends indirectly from claim 53 and consequently includes the features of presenting a plurality of different forms for displaying the transmissible media content and enabling selection, on a wireless client device, of at least one form for displaying transmissible media content, among other things.

The Examiner admits that Gilhuly is deficient at least for failing to teach that "the action property includes one of a Mail To property and a Dial Phone property" (see the December 16, 2004 Office Action at page 6, paragraph 6). The Examiner relies on Wagner for disclosing this feature. Wagner appears to disclose a graphical user interface for a portable telephone that enables a user to access both electronic mail and voice mail messages (see Wagner at the Abstract). However, Wagner does not teach or suggest the deficiencies of Gilhuly discussed above. Even if Examiner's allegation with respect to Wagner is accepted, claim 61 is distinguishable over the cited references because the combination of Gilhuly and Wagner fail to provide the features of independent claim 53.

Attorney Docket No. 042846-0312951

Serial No. 09/885,151

Reply under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: February 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000